

The Victories of Revisionism (Part 2)

[Robert Faurisson](#)

The article that follows was written on September 11, 2011 as a continuation to the paper "[The Victories of Revisionism](#)" that Professor Faurisson presented in Tehran on December 11, 2006. For that presentation Professor Faurisson is being prosecuted by the French government. His case was recently adjourned until June 2016.— Ed.

On December 11, 2006 I completed a twenty-page study entitled "[The Victories of Revisionism](#)." In it I noted, as examples, twenty victories won by the revisionists on the strictly historical and scientific level, whereas, on the media and judicial levels, their opponents continued to occupy nearly all the terrain. The "Holocaust" sectarians concealed their defeats and went on deceiving the public as they had been doing since 1945. But now, suddenly, the accelerated development of the Internet and the evolution of the world situation, so unfortunate for the State of Israel and the United States of America, have gradually changed the order of things. Revisionism's victories have started getting talked about. In particular, there is a proliferation of websites, forums and blogs where visitors have been able to learn, first, of the concessions made to the revisionists by "Holocaust" historians, and then of the real capitulations to which some of the latter have been driven.

To begin, in 1979, a group of 34 French academics signed a joint statement that was most revealing of their inability to describe the operation of "the magical gas chamber" (Louis-Ferdinand Céline); they pitifully declared: "One must not ask oneself how, *technically*, such a mass-murder was possible. It was technically possible, since it happened" (*Le Monde*, February 21, 1979, p. 23). In 1985 Raul Hilberg, the most eminent historian of the "Holocaust," finally acknowledged that there was, after all, no known evidence of the reality of any order, plan or organization aiming at the physical destruction of the European Jews and, in order to continue upholding that fiction nonetheless, he decided to resort to some astonishing explanations in the vein of what might be called "group parapsychology" (see below). In 1995 Jean-Claude Pressac, Serge Klarsfeld's liege man, definitively laid down his arms (see below). In the years thereafter something of a general desertion or rout could be observed among historians of the "Holocaust": feigning ignorance of what, in 1968 in her main academic dissertation, the Jewish historian Olga Wormser-Migot had herself been compelled to call "the problem of the gas chambers" and passing over in silence a number of other historical "problems" of that kind, they were content to repeat the purely gratuitous statements of the judges at Nuremberg and, for the most part, did not venture to look for historical and scientific evidence of their "Holocaust."

But one Jewish researcher remained in the running, the one whom I, for my part, called "the last of the Jewish Mohicans"; that was my sobriquet for Robert Jan van Pelt. However, once again, the matter was to end with a kind of capitulation. As will be seen below, on December 27, 2009 the fellow wound up his lengthy research work with the following observation: as concerns Auschwitz, for virtually everything "we know" about that camp (capital of the "Holocaust," visited by millions of believers) there is simply no evidence to be found...there at Auschwitz; it would be better to stop spending so much money trying to preserve the place; nature should take it back! This researcher's embarrassment is indeed understandable: he would prefer to see the pure fabrications, like the crematorium at Auschwitz I, disappear ("Everything in it is false," as French historian Eric Conan eventually found in 1995: *L'Express*, January 19-25, 1995, p. 68; on this subject see point no. 16

at <http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/2006/12/victories-of-revisionism.html> and the article at http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v15/v15n1p23_Weber.html).

From 1979 to 2009, that is, for thirty years, the proponents of the authorized version of Second World War history have failed in their attempts to reply to the revisionists on the level of history, science, material research and the careful study of documents and testimonies. To compensate for this failure the “Holocaust” worshipers have sought refuge via the reserves of imagination or belief; hence a remarkable propagation of novels, notoriously false “testimonies,” plays, films, ceremonies, pilgrimages. And so it is that “Shoah Business” and the “Holocaust Religion” have flooded the world with their products and their phantasmagoria.

For their part, feeling the wind is in their sails, the revisionists will continue staying the course taken back in the late 1940s by, in particular, Maurice Bardèche and Paul Rassinier. Revisionist authors or activists have appeared in many countries around the world, especially in Europe and the United States. The most outstanding of the authors is unquestionably the American Arthur R. Butz; in order not to compromise his personal safety I shall avoid giving the name here of the most extraordinary activist. I also have in mind a number of other authors, in particular authors of German, Austrian, Belgian, Spanish, French, Italian, Swiss, Canadian, Australian or South American nationality. The list of North Americans who have participated in the past or who, like Bradley Smith and his friends, are active in the revisionist struggle today is relatively long.

An image haunts our contemporaries, that of the mounds of bodies discovered at the liberation of the German concentration camps in 1945. In that dreadful, fixating image they think they see proof of the inhumanity of the “Nazis” and, as a result, they believe by instinct that the revisionists are basically individuals who have taken up the task of rehabilitating Adolf Hitler. I wish these uninitiated, who, at the outset, close their hearts and minds to revisionism and let themselves be carried by their emotions, would start making an effort to reflect on the reality that lay behind the photographs and films in which they believe they see the harrowing proof of “Nazi atrocities.”

The Photographs and Films Showing Corpses

In my youth I myself had been shocked by the spectacle of the dead and the walking corpses in the camp at Bergen-Belsen. A bulldozer was seen pushing bodies of inmates towards the edge of great ditches, bodies which SS women then threw into those ditches. We were shown an SS physician, Dr. Fritz Klein, seated, legs apart, in the midst of one of them and appearing to think rather highly of himself, while Franz Hössler, another SS man, was seen standing before a truck laden with corpses, seemingly giving a self-satisfied speech. Many years later I would come to realize that, in this case, I had actually been the victim of a propaganda film and its artifices.

In the last months of an atrocious war, in the chaos to which Germany had been reduced, Bergen-Belsen, utterly swamped with detainees coming from the East, had been ravaged by a typhus epidemic. In the days following the camp’s liberation on April 15, 1945 – that is, when the British had taken charge – perhaps close to 14,000 people would still die, especially of typhus. In what remained of their cities the civilians had become cave dwellers, staying in whatever holes in the ground they could find, fallen prey to hunger and cold. At Bergen-Belsen there were practically no more supplies, medicine or means of disinfection.

It was in this disastrous situation that the SS officer Josef Kramer, commandant of the camp, decided to send a delegation under a white flag in the direction of British Field Marshal Montgomery's troops so as to warn them that they were approaching a huge den of infection, and that the detainees, once released, would have to be prevented from spreading typhus among the Allied soldiers and the German population. A cooperation agreement was made between, on the one hand, the *Wehrmacht* (excluding the SS) and, on the other hand, senior British army officers. The latter, once having arrived on the scene, decided to open the common graves and count the dead, then, after the count, reburied them in new ditches. Actually, a bulldozer did push the bodies to the edge of the ditches but the driver was a Tommy, whom I, like masses of other spectators before me, had once taken for a German soldier. As late as 1978 – the better to maintain that same error in peoples' minds, presumably – a photograph would be published which "beheaded" the driver of that bulldozer (Arthur Suzman & Denis Diamond, *Six Million Did Die: The Truth Shall Prevail*, Johannesburg, South African Jewish Board of Deputies, Second Edition, 1978, p. 19). SS women were made to stand alongside the ditch and then throw the bodies in, barehanded. As for Dr. F. Klein and F. Hössler, they were made to play an affected role and thus appear to illustrate the pride inspired by SS men in their supposed work of death. J. Kramer, himself, after being beaten by soldiers of the Royal British Artillery, was to be locked up for a whole night in a refrigeration room to break his "arrogance" (Dr. G.-L. Fréjafon, *Bergen-Belsen Bagne Sanatorium*, Paris, Librairie Valois, 1947, p. 22). A good many other camps offered the spectacle of hundreds of corpses and one can easily imagine the disgust of the liberators, arrested by the smell of victims of either typhus or dysentery whom, given their numbers, it had not been possible to bury.

To take another example of deception by photography, everyone may well have felt revulsion upon seeing the neatly aligned corpses in the Nordhausen camp, but it was to be learned after some time that those dead were in fact victims of an Allied bombing raid targeting mainly the military barracks called *Bölke Kaserne*. Meanwhile, at Dachau, Buchenwald and elsewhere identical sights lent credence to the legend that those camps, conceived and run as "death camps," had been equipped with homicidal "gas chambers" regularly achieving an extravagant daily turnover. Upon verification, the official historians had admitted, under the pressure exerted by revisionist authors and especially by Paul Rassinier, author of *The Holocaust Story and the Lies of Ulysses*, that despite the many "testimonies" of priests, professors and doctors, the alleged "gassings" of detainees there had never taken place (Martin Broszat, of the Institut für Zeitgeschichte in Munich, "Keine Vergasung in Dachau [Bergen-Belsen, Buchenwald]", *Die Zeit*, August 19, 1960, p. 16).

Shame on the Germans? Or on the Allies? Or on War?

The day when Copernicus showed that the sun did not revolve around the earth but that, on the contrary, the earth revolved around the sun there occurred what it has become customary to call a "Copernican revolution." The expression means not only that reality may differ from appearance – a fact easily noted – but also that reality can be situated at the exact opposite of appearance. This is what happened after the war when some researchers realized that a number of the horrors first attributed to the losers, that is to say, in Europe mainly the Germans, were perhaps, in reality, attributable to the Allies. Consequently, in the face of all those photographs that made people cry out "Shame on Germany!", it would perhaps be more just to say "Shame on the Allies who put Germany in that state!", or else to conclude "Shame on war and its train of abominations!" Upon advancing into Germany the GI's themselves had been surprised at the extent of damage wrought by their aviation. One should be conscious of the fact that Churchill and Roosevelt had innovated when, fitting out their aircraft fleets

with adequate capability, they had set about waging a systematic war – against civilians – on such a scale as history had never known. They had decided to raze the cities, big or small, and sometimes even the villages. From their standpoint it was necessary, by fire from the sky, bombardments of towns and villages, low-flying machine-gunning of city-dwellers trying to escape from the furnaces or of farmers in their fields, to make life impossible for all Germans without exception. Houses, hospitals, schools, universities, men, women, children, old people, livestock, everything had to disappear. The trains must no longer be able to run: they would need several days to make a journey that would normally have taken a few hours; one can imagine in what state convoys of detainees, for example, arrived at their destination after leaving, by force or by choice, the camps in the East before the arrival of the Soviets. Taking into consideration the decision made by Roosevelt and Churchill, one must agree that it was easier to attack civilians in that way rather than military personnel. Sometimes in the camp of the Western Allies certain lofty consciences, notably clerics, were heard protesting against such savagery, of which the Dresden bombings remain the prime example. But the propaganda, for its part, argued for the duty to destroy all that in one way or another stood for Satan or, in the minds of Jewish propagandists, Amalek. Indeed, since then, in Japan, Vietnam, Iraq and a few other corners of the globe, the Americans have been led to wage the same type of devastating war.

The Judicial Masquerades of Victors Putting the Vanquished on Trial

I myself, being, if I may say so, at the *extreme center* of opinions concerning politics or history, cannot pronounce condemnation of a given belligerent's having sought, as in a kind of competition in the matter, to invent still more means of killing than its opponent. I would be content to say that for me, *every war is a butchery; the winner is a good butcher and the loser not so good a butcher; on the other hand, at the end of a war, the winner may at most administer to the vanquished lessons in butchery but not lessons in law, justice or virtue.* Yet that is what happened at the Nuremberg trial (1945-1946) and in a thousand other "trials" of the same calibre up to today where we see Jewish organizations demanding that sickly nonagenarians be carried into court on a stretcher for "crimes" generally going back seventy years and for which there is no evidence nor sometimes even the least witness: the defendant had perhaps simply found himself in the wrong place at the wrong time; for instance, he had supposedly been at Treblinka, a camp in which some presume to say, without the least evidence, that, according to certain persons, homicidal "steam chambers" operated (Nuremberg Document PS-3311), and according to others, homicidal "gas chambers": the "testimonies" are vague, contradictory and the trouble has never been taken to verify them, which, as certain revisionists like the Australian Richard Krege have proved, is nonetheless possible and shows that the revisionists are right ("Treblinka Ground Radar Examination Finds No Trace of Mass Graves," in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 19, No. 3, May-June 2000, p. 20: http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v19/v19n3p20_radar.html).

At Nuremberg the victors tried the vanquished; they were thus both judge and party to the case; they had decided beforehand that, if necessary, one would do without real evidence: "The Tribunal shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence [...]. The Tribunal shall not require proof of facts of common knowledge but shall take judicial notice thereof [...]" (Articles 19 and 21 of the Charter of the International Military Tribunal). Moreover, the victors' justice violated the usages of normal justice in ignoring the separation of powers (some of those who took part in the drafting of the Charter went on to become judges and prosecutors), instituting collective responsibility (any member of a group declared "criminal" was automatically considered a criminal himself), implementing retroactivity of laws and

denying those convicted any possibility of appeal. No representatives of the neutral nations were among the judges and prosecutors. In all seriousness the Soviets, with the concurrence of the American, British and French judges, had the audacity to rebuke the Germans *for having carried out deportations and used concentration camps or forced-labor camps!* Resorting to an additional specification of Article 19 of the Charter, the Soviet prosecutor got the judges to refuse any serious investigation of the crime in Katyn Forest imputed to the Germans. As for the principal Soviet judge, Major General I.T. Nikitchenko, he had served as prosecutor in 1936 at the previous judicial masquerades called “the Moscow trials,” something that had not kept him from being recruited for Nuremberg.

At bottom, if one keeps in mind the crimes perpetrated against the German people by means of an air war aiming to exterminate civilians, if one recalls the deportations (called displacements) of the German minorities from Central and Eastern Europe, if one adds to that both the serial rapes of German women and girls (as happened, for example, at the age of twelve, to Hannelore Kohl, future wife of the chancellor; see Heribert Schwan, *Die Frau an seiner Seite / Leben und Leiden der Hannelore Kohl*, Munich, Wilhelm Heyne Verlag, 2011, p. 54-58), if one bears in mind the looting, the official grabbing by the Allies of Germany’s silver, gold, platinum, jewelry, securities, properties, banks, museums, scientific and industrial patents and if, to cap it all, one notes that the Nuremberg trials of German leaders earned the description, by some, of “a farce” or, in the words of Harlan Fiske Stone, Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, a “high-grade lynching party,” one can only find it deplorable that, for 66 years, our schools, universities and media have ceaselessly been telling us that, during the last world war, the victors represented Good and the vanquished, Evil.



Elie Wiesel aged 15 in late 1943 or early 1944.

Elie Wiesel [CC BY 3.0 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>)], via Wikimedia Commons

Elie Wiesel: a Prominent False Witness

Elie Wiesel ideally embodies this lack of understanding of human nature, which everywhere, in fact, is made up of a combination of Good and Evil. This unintelligence leads him, in his efforts to uphold the argument that the people of Israel is the salt of the earth and suffers from Evil more than any other, to lie with assurance, preach hatred for the opponent and untiringly ask us all to go and, in a way, spit on the graves of the defeated. In January 1945 he and his father had had the choice, offered by the Germans, between staying on at Auschwitz until the arrival of the Soviets, or being transferred to a camp inside Germany; the two of them, after careful consideration, chose to leave with their exterminators rather than wait for their liberators. Having gotten to Buchenwald, where his father was to die of dysentery and where, it seems, the Germans were killing 10,000 people a day (Stephan Kaptai, "Author, Teacher, Witness," *Time Magazine*, March 18, 1985, p.

79: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,963362,00.html>), he nonetheless played chess there at times (Jorge Semprun and Elie Wiesel, *Se taire est impossible (Keeping Silent Is Impossible)*, Paris, Arte Editions, 1997, p. 12). In Elie Wiesel, as will have been noted, there is much of the clown who knows that the more he exaggerates, the more the audience will appreciate him. On February 7, 1996, he received the decoration of an honorary doctorate from the University of Picardy - Jules Verne. In its issue of February 9, *Le Courrier Picard* wrote of the talk that Wiesel gave there and of his replies to questions from those attending: "One query came from many in the audience: 'What do you think of the emergence of revisionist and denialist currents?' [E. Wiesel answered:] 'They are virulent anti-Semites, depraved, organized and well funded. The day I received the Nobel Prize [December 10, 1986 in Oslo], there were hundreds of them in the streets demonstrating against me. Never will I grant them the dignity of a debate. They are morally sick beings. I think I know how to fight injustice, I don't know how to fight ugliness.'" As Serge Thion and Pierre Guillaume, who accompanied me in Oslo in 1986, can attest, along with myself, the number of demonstrators there that day amounted quite precisely to zero. The truth is that with my two revisionist friends I handed out that day copies, in English and Swedish (easily readable for Norwegians), of my flier on "Elie Wiesel: a Prominent False Witness" (<http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/2010/04/prominent-false-witness-elie-wiesel.html>). At the entrance to the hall where the award was about to be presented we had, in an extremely quick action, distributed the text to about forty people; then we in turn entered the hall where, for my part, I struggled to contain my laughter when the Nobel candidate started intoning something of a chant, perhaps a Jewish one, but to an assuredly buffoonish effect. At the exit, the billionaire philosopher Bernard-Henri Levy, flanking Elie Wiesel on the left, cast a dark look at us.

We Need a Return to the Search for Accuracy

But, personally, I have a dream: the day may come when, after a screening of *Night and Fog* (the classic propaganda film by Alain Resnais), imposed on all children in France, the teacher, instead of fostering the pupils' tendency to unthinking indignation and rash judgment, will ask them to reflect a bit. He or she will teach them to gauge the distance there can be, in this film as in numerous other documentaries-documentaries, between image and commentary. These images we are shown here: what exactly do they signify? What do those abominations, those piles of corpses, that bulldozer mean? As for that concrete room with the "ceiling, furrowed by fingernails": on the basis of what forensic investigation is it called a "gas chamber," that is, a chemical slaughterhouse for human beings? Where have fingernails (of mere keratin) ever been known to "furrow" a concrete surface? Upon seeing so many corpses, whom is one to accuse? The loser? Or, quite simply, war and its inevitable train of horrors? Or again, in this particular case, all things considered, would it not be the ruthless war policy conducted by the winner?

Later on there will still be time to teach the adolescents or the adults that the pupils have become, that, as all too often in the human adventure, “the first casualty in any war is the truth,” that “it’s the winner who writes history,” that “justice gladly lies down in the winner’s bed” and that, in the words of the foremost French author of the 20th century, L.-F. Céline, “the frenzy of lying and believing is catching like the itch”. Yes, lying and credulity often go together. We need to try to guard against the two evils, or else get cured of their effects. For this it is essential, before pronouncing a judgment on anything, to work, reflect, examine, weigh, and, again to weigh, examine, reflect, and work again. There is no tougher school than the revision of conventional wisdom. This school is none other than that of revisionism. The revisionists do not deny; they are neither deniers nor denialists; they strive to be constructive, positive and at times some of them might be classed as positivists. Their research method is as old as the world; it is like the thirst for knowledge or the love of science and the exact. Let us be modest and avoid claiming that we seek the truth, or that we have found it. “The truth,” especially when that word is adorned with a capital letter, risks being vague or inaccessible. What should be sought is accuracy, that is to say, at each instant a small verifiable truth; it is the sum of those little verifiable truths which, at the end, will make it possible to enunciate a conclusion that, in turn, has some chance of being exact.

The Black Boxes of the “Holocaust” Have to Be Rooted out and Their Contents Examined

This type of revisionist research or activity is not without hazard. To embark upon, and, especially, to keep on with revisionist action takes guts. Elie Wiesel and his friends stand guard around the black boxes of the “Holocaust”: there is no question of letting us approach and see what they contain. Yet, personally, I had the luck one day of discovering and opening for an instant the black box of Auschwitz and Birkenau at the Auschwitz State Museum. This happened in two stages. In 1975, during my first examination of the scenes of the “crime,” I had detected some downright anomalies in what is shown to us as a crematorium in its original state (*Krema I* at Auschwitz proper, that is, Auschwitz I main camp) or crematoria in ruins (*Kremas II and III* as well as *IV and V* at Birkenau, or “Auschwitz II”). I then got a senior official of the museum to acknowledge that *Krema I* had been “reconstructed,” whereas the public thought they were seeing a genuine crematorium kept in its original state. I had him note the absence of any soot at the mouth of a crematory oven, which he assured me was “original”; then he told me that the said oven was actually a “reconstruction,” whereupon I made him admit that the “reconstruction” necessarily implied the knowledge and, therefore, the existence of building plans for the crematoria. I asked him where the plans were. Not without embarrassment he confessed that they were in the camp archives. Being obliged to return to France, I put off my visit to the archives till the following year. I shall pass over the details of the difficulties encountered then and come straight to the conclusion: *on March 19, 1976 I discovered in the archives of the State Museum the building plans of the Auschwitz and Birkenau crematoria, supposed to have contained the homicidal “gas chambers.” Those plans had been kept hidden from us since 1945* (see my piece “A Look back at My Discovery, on March 19 1976, of the Building Plans for the Auschwitz and Birkenau Crematoria”: <http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/2010/09/look-back-at-my-discovery-on-march-19.html>).

And for good reason, as they now revealed a special secret. In the small *Krematorium I*, the room said to have been a homicidal “gas chamber” had in reality been a “*Leichenhalle*,” that is, an innocuous depository or mortuary room in which to put corpses awaiting cremation. The large *Krematoriums II and III* of Birkenau had possessed only “*Leichenkeller*,” that is depositories built partly underground to

ensure a relatively cool interior. *Krematoriums* IV and V, also located at Birkenau, contained only harmless rooms some of which were equipped with stoves and which could never have served as “gas chambers.” At the end of prolonged studies, one after another, on Zyklon B (a product based on hydrogen cyanide gas, invented in 1922 by an assistant of the German Jewish chemist Fritz Haber and patented on December 27, 1926), the disinfecting or delousing gas chambers and, especially, the American execution gas chambers using cyanide gas, I concluded that *the “testimonies” or “confessions” concerning the systematic execution of Jews in “gas chambers” ran into radical physical and chemical impossibilities.*

Even today I am still amazed at the fact that the United States, swamped in Holocaust literature but possessing so many men of science, both in chemistry and engineering, should have had no one to proceed with a comparison between the somewhat vague Nazi “gas chambers” and the easily verifiable reality (at least up until a recent time) of the American gas chambers. It is enough to see one of these to realize instantly that the Nazi “gas chambers” are purely a figment of the imagination. A real gas chamber for the execution of a single person is necessarily a terribly complicated thing, for the gasser must avoid gassing himself 1) either in the execution phase, 2) or during ventilation, 3) or when entering the chamber and handling and removing a highly cyanided body which, being so, remains highly dangerous. I repeat that it would suffice, even for the uninitiated, to see up close an American prison’s gas chamber and to have its operation explained to understand that not only did the Nazi “gas chambers” not exist but also that *they could not even have existed.* For my part, in 1979, I had seen and studied the gas chamber in Baltimore, Maryland. Also in 1979, in Los Angeles, at the first international conference of the Institute for Historical Review, I made public my discovery of *the black box of Auschwitz and Birkenau.* “This is dynamite!”, one lady in the audience judged.

The victories of revisionism

Three years earlier, in 1976, an American academic, Arthur Robert Butz, had published on the subject of the alleged extermination of the Jews a masterful book entitled *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century.* In 1985 and again in 1988 in Toronto, at the trials of Ernst Zündel, the revisionists annihilated first Raul Hilberg, the Number One historian for the exterminationist case, then Rudolf Vrba, the Number One witness of the alleged criminal gassings at Auschwitz, and finally, thanks in particular to the examinations made by Fred Leuchter, the whole myth of the gassings was at the point of death. Afterwards this central element, the “heart” of the charges against the Germans of the Third Reich, would be seen slowly disintegrating. For example, in 1988, Arno Mayer, professor of history at Princeton, wrote: “Sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable” (*Why Did the Heavens Not Darken? The “Final Solution” in History*, New York, Pantheon Books, p. 362). Other researchers, who before had trumpeted their certainty of the existence of those “gas chambers”, have ended up admitting that there is no proof thereof. The Frenchman Jean-Claude Pressac, protégé of Beate and Serge Klarsfeld – themselves “hunters of former Nazis” – went so far as to acknowledge that the whole dossier of the history of the wartime deportation was “rotten” with too many lies and that this dossier, notwithstanding the real sufferings of so many deportees, was henceforth good only for the “rubbish bins of history”; Pressac wrote that in 1995 but his capitulation was revealed only in 2000. To those wishing to learn more about the matter I would recommend my study on “The Victories of Revisionism” of December 11, 2006 (<http://inconvenienthistory.com/7/4/99/>).

The *coup de grâce* Given, on December 27, 2009, to the Myth of the Nazi “ Gas Chambers”

Three years afterwards, on December 27, 2009, the myth of Auschwitz received the *coup de grâce*. The blow was administered by a Jewish academic, Robert Jan van Pelt, whom one may consider the last person to have sought to *prove scientifically* that Auschwitz, the capital of the “Holocaust,” had been an “extermination camp” (an American term coined in November 1944), that is, a camp equipped with extermination “gas chambers.” The revisionists had no opponent more determined and more resolved to fight them *on the historical and scientific level* than this professor teaching the history of architecture at the University of Waterloo (Ontario, Canada). He defended the usual argument holding that, to gas several thousand Jews at a time, an SS man, having gotten up on the roof of certain “gas chambers,” poured Zyklon B pellets through four holes made in the concrete ceiling of the said “gas chambers.” Ever under the pressure of revisionist discoveries, he had been bound to concur that the holes in the small *Krematorium I* had been created by... the Soviets and the Polish communists. But R. J. van Pelt and his friends were sure of finding such holes in the concrete roofs, in ruins, of *Krematoriums II* and *III*. However, after years of research, they proved unable to supply a single photograph of those holes or of the perforated shafts (?) that allegedly had allowed the diffusion of hydrogen cyanide gas underneath, thus failing to meet my challenge summed up in the formula: “*No holes, no Holocaust.*” Hence the capitulation of R. J. van Pelt. On December 27, 2009, quoted in an article in the *Toronto Star*, he revealed that, in his opinion, the conservation of Auschwitz-Birkenau made little sense: it was better to let nature take it back. And he added, speaking of what we are supposed to know about the camp (that is, that there were “gas chambers,” etc. there), these precise words: “*Ninety-nine per cent of what we know we do not actually have the physical evidence to prove*”, going on to say of the “Holocaust” in general that, in future: “*We will know about it from literature and eyewitness testimony [...]. To demand that we have more material evidence is actually us somehow giving in to the Holocaust deniers by providing some sort of special evidence*” (“[A case for letting nature take back Auschwitz](#)”, *Toronto Star*, December 27, 2009).

Those lines did not fail to remind me of the extraordinary admission, of the kind to make revisionists celebrate, to which English judge Charles Gray was reduced when, on April 11, 2000, he handed down his decision in the libel case brought in London by David Irving against Penguin Books and Deborah Lipstadt. Miss Lipstadt had gotten van Pelt to attend and support her defense, while Irving, whose acquaintance with revisionist argumentation was mediocre, for fear of being associated with Germar Rudolf and myself did not want our assistance: he had even gone so far as to base his lawsuit on the fact that he had been presented to the world as a “Holocaust denier.” The admission by the judge was devastating for van Pelt, who had devoted part of his life to trying to find evidence of the homicidal “gas chambers” existence. Here it is: “*I have to confess that, in common I suspect with most other people, I had supposed that the evidence of mass extermination of Jews in the gas chambers at Auschwitz was compelling. I have, however, set aside this preconception when assessing the evidence adduced by the parties in these proceedings*” (High Court of Justice, Queen’s Bench Division 1996-I-1113, Judgment, § 13.71; <http://www.fpp.co.uk/docs/trial/judgment/extract1.html>).

Immediately after the paragraph bearing his stunning “admission” the judge gives us, in § 13.72, 13.73 and 13.74, the specific reasons why he, like a revisionist, has revised and corrected his “preconception.” What we see here, essentially, is a British judge taking up, in April 2000 in London, the finding pronounced seventeen years before, on April 26, 1983, in Paris, by the First Chamber of the Court of Appeal (Section A, presided over by François Grégoire): for it, Robert Faurisson, accused by Jewish organizations essentially of having, in his work, exhibited 1) levity, 2) negligence, 3) willful

ignorance and 4) mendacity, to arrive at the conclusion that the Nazi “gas chambers” had never existed, had in fact done a job where there could not be found a trace either of 1) levity, 2) negligence, 3) willful ignorance or 4) mendacity. The judges then stated: “The worth of the findings defended by Mr. Faurisson [on the problem of the gas chambers] is *therefore* [my emphasis] a matter solely for the appraisal of experts, historians and the public.” In plain language this meant that, in view of the serious nature of Faurisson’s writings on the subject, everyone should have the right to say: “The alleged Hitlerite gas chambers never existed.”

But, of course, on that day in Paris back in 1983 I was nonetheless held liable for “personal injury” because, it seems, I had been malevolent; in particular, I found myself reproached for having “never seen fit to find a word of respect for the victims” (which was inaccurate), and my “‘revisionism’ [might] appear like an attempt at overall rehabilitation of the Nazi war criminals” (which was a thought or an afterthought that I had never had). On his end, David Irving lost his case in London on April 14, 2000 because, it seems, he had been as malevolent as a racist can be.

The *Einsatzgruppen*: No Order to Kill the Jews

What with the case for the existence of the Nazi “gas chambers” becoming ever more difficult to uphold, the official historians and the media have set about focusing on the *Einsatzgruppen*. Not shrinking from any manner of cheating, they have in some instances begun dressing up those “Intervention Groups” with the label, invented by themselves, “Mobile killing squads.”

The *Einsatzgruppen* carrying out their activities in the USSR had the job of protecting the advancing army’s rear, particularly due to the presence of snipers and partisans who succeeded in killing numerous German soldiers and perpetrating sabotage. Never did the *Einsatzgruppen* receive an order to execute Jews as such. Jews could be shot for acts of either terrorism or sabotage or, as hostages in retaliation either for such acts or for some similar reason. The assertions to the contrary and the mental constructions made around a supposed “*Kommissar Befehl*” or the confession of SS General Otto Ohlendorf at Nuremberg are on the order of myth. In general, “despite the most erudite research” (François Furet, speaking at the end of a conference at the Sorbonne on July 2, 1982), never has such an order been found. Even the most indulgent or subservient historians have had to admit this; see particularly, for example, regarding the *Einsatzgruppen*, Helmut Krausnick and Hans-Heinrich Wilhelm in *Die Truppe des Weltanschauungskrieges / Die Einsatzgruppen des Sicherheitspolizei und des SD*, Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1981, p. 634; also, Yaacov Lozowick in “Rollbahn: The Early Activities of Einsatzgruppe C,” *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Oxford, 1987, Vol. 2, p. 221-241.

For Want of Evidence, Raul Hilberg Explains It All by the Paranormal

As for the deliberate character of the alleged extermination of the Jews of a whole continent, Raul Hilberg was not afraid of stating, in 1961 in the first edition of his work of reference, that there had been two orders from Hitler to kill the Jews (*The Destruction of the European Jews*, Chicago, Quadrangle Books, p. 177). Following the emergence of historical revisionism on the international scene he abandoned that statement, which had not been accompanied by any document or evidence, and came up with another, asserting that, if no document or evidence could be found, it was because the destruction of European Jewry had been done spontaneously, without orders, without a plan, without anything, thanks to the initiative and action of a large bureaucracy working to that purpose by means of thought transmission (*The Destruction of the European Jews*, Revised and Definitive Edition, New York

and London, Holmes & Meier, 3 volumes, 1985, pp. 53, 55, 62)! According to the new Hilberg, that strange bureaucracy, thought to be so obedient and punctilious, had at some point suddenly taken the initiative to throw overboard all bureaucratic restraint and all obedience to whatever orders came from above, and did so to set about killing the Jews ; from then on it had worked only “[by an incredible meeting of minds, a consensus-mind reading](#)”, and without any “basic plan,” with “written directives not published,” “broad authorizations to subordinates, not published,” “oral directives and authorizations,” “basic understandings of officials resulting in decisions not requiring orders or explanations.” Hilberg explains that “no one agency was charged with the whole operation”; “no single organization directed or coordinated the entire process”; “no special agency was created and no special budget was devised to destroy the Jews of Europe”; “In the final analysis, the destruction of the Jews was not so much a product of laws and commands, as it was a matter of spirit, of shared comprehension, of consonance and synchronization” (“Raul Hilberg explique maintenant le génocide par télépathie” [Raul Hilberg now explains the genocide by telepathy], <http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/1988/09/raul-hilberg-explique-maintenant-le.html>).

One can only stand dumbfounded when faced with these phantasmagoria invented by the Number One “Holocaust” historian, with these absurd explanations by the working of the Holy Spirit within the German bureaucracy, this “meeting of minds” described by Hilberg in person as “incredible”; before this recourse to the power of “consensus-mind reading,” this “matter of spirit,” this “shared comprehension,” this “consonance” and “synchronization.” Never, I think, in world historiography has an argument been put forth and defended by the use of notions that belong to such an extent to the realm of *magic*. And *black magic* at that, when one thinks of the harmful or criminal effects that the general belief in “the destruction of the European Jews” has since 1945 been able to have on billions of people around the world.

Facts Refute the Reality of a Destruction of European Jewry

Curiously, the authors who presume to uphold the case for the existence of a Third Reich policy to exterminate the Jews fail to explain a considerable number of facts which, had there been such a policy, would be incomprehensible. As A. R. Butz wrote, “The simplest valid reason for being skeptical about the extermination claim is also the simplest conceivable reason: at the end of the war they were still there” (*The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, p. 10). In 1945, at war’s end, the number of Jewish “survivors” or “miraculous” Jewish survivors was staggering. So many “miraculous survivors” could not be a miracle but rather the manifestation of a natural fact. Each survivor who dares to testify that people of his or her category were systematically slaughtered is making, by the sheer fact of still being alive, a self-refutation argument: he or she is “living proof” that the statement is absurd. Still in 1997, fifty-two years after the war, the official number of Jewish survivors was assessed, by some at 834,000 and by others at 960,000 (“Holocaust Survivors” by Adina Mishkoff, Administrative Assistant, Amcha, Jerusalem, August 13, 1997; these figures were provided by the office of the Israeli Prime Minister).

According to an estimate by the Swedish statistician Carl Nordling, to whom I submitted the Israeli government assessments, if those figures are rounded to an average of 900,000 then it will be reasonable to conclude that in 1945 the number of survivors slightly exceeded three million. Even today, the “survivors” organizations abound under the most varied names; they bring together former Jewish *résistants*, Jewish forced laborers, Jews who were fugitives or living undercover during the war as well as former “children of Auschwitz”; this last group includes Jewish children born in that camp or

interned there from infancy with their parents. Auschwitz, like many other camps, was equipped with hospital buildings or infirmaries where Jews, like Elie Wiesel himself, had access to care.

In the Middle of the Reich, at the Height of the War, Homes and Hospitals for Jews

In German cities, up to the end of the war, there were hospitals or homes reserved for Jews. We may take the example of Vienna: according to a German document published in English translation by R. Hilberg himself, on October 17, 1944, that is, several months before the end of the war, the Council of Elders of the Jews in Vienna was responsible for Jewish hospitals, a children's home and day school, a community kitchen, a bathhouse, a poor people's home (for the elderly), a clothes and furniture depot, a relief (or welfare) division, a library, cemetery administration and grounds, a technical column with its workshop. The whole was spread out over eleven different points in the city. On October 17, 1944 an Allied bombing raid completely destroyed the children's hospital. In the night that followed, a new makeshift hospital had to be installed ("as an emergency measure a new hospital had to be set up overnight") and, in agreement with "the Secret State Police (*Gestapo*) Main Directorate for Vienna and the City Construction Office," "the Council handed the supervision of building and carpentry to a competent architect against payment of a lump sum." The community kitchen, reserved primarily for Jewish workers (43,892 meals served in 1944), was hit during the raid of November 5, 1944 but the damage was very quickly repaired (Yad Vashem document O 30 / 5, Excerpts from the Annual Report of the Director of the Council of Elders of the Jews in Vienna, signed Josef Israel Lowenherz, dated January 22, 1945, *Documents of Destruction / Germany and Jewry 1933-1945*, Edited with Commentary by Raul Hilberg, Chicago, Quadrangle Books, 1971, p. 125-130, p. 127-128).

Another example, one that speaks volumes, is that of Berlin and, especially, of its "Hospital of the Jewish community" (*Krankenhaus der Jüdischen Gemeinde*) at No. 2 Iranischestrasse. A book to read on this subject is Daniel B. Silver's *Refuge in Hell / How Berlin's Jewish Hospital Outlasted the Nazis*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 2003, p. 352. The author, a Jewish lawyer, and his Jewish witnesses rack their brains trying to solve the problem: "With Hitler having decided to exterminate the Jews, how is it that so many Jews, all through the war, should have received regular medical care in this hospital run by Dr. Walter Lustig?" In the end, the answer consists in just two short sentences: "There is no explaining it. It was all a miracle." The miracle itself was presumably composed of two main factors: "sheer blind luck and bureaucratic infighting among Nazi organizations" (as the back cover presentation puts it). If there was a consuming fear in the hearts of all Berlin's Jews – including the patients, surgeons and physicians, nurses and other staff of their hospital – it was that of the terrifying, indiscriminate bombing by the Anglo-American air squadrons.

Finally, with regard to facts opposing the assertion, made without evidence, that Third Reich Germany was exterminating the Jews, a French study is worth reading, rich in astonishing revelations; entitled "*Vie quotidienne des juifs allemands pendant la guerre (Trois documents)*" (Daily Life of German Jews during the War – Three Documents), it appeared in the *Revue d'histoire révisionniste* n° 6 (May 1992), p. 131-140. The piece bore the byline of "Célestin Loos" but actually had two authors: the Belgian Pierre Moreau, recently deceased, and myself. The case of the Berlin Jewish hospital (director: Dr Walter Lustig) is mentioned in passing (p. 138, note 3).

Jewish Collaboration with the German Occupiers

In a 1992 study on the “Brown Jews,” reproduced in my *Ecrits révisionnistes (1974-1998)* (pages 1421 to 1433: <http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/1992/05/propos-de-larret-touvier-laffaire-des.html>), I brought up the existence and role of the “Jewish Councils in Europe” (pp. 1429-1430) in the following terms:

From late 1939 the Germans imposed the creation of “Jewish Councils” for the administration of Jewish communities in Poland in cities, provinces or ghettos. Some Councils tried hard to thwart German policy, but most brought an important contribution to the German war effort. They provided labour and manufactured goods. This policy of resolved collaboration was followed by Mordechai Chaim Rumkowski, the famous “King of Lodz”, who went so far as to issue his own currency, Jacob Gens of Vilnius, Moshe Merin of Sosnowiec in Silesia and Efraim Barasz of Bialystok. These Councils condemned armed struggle against the Germans, some going so far as to combat the resistance fighters. Germany had its “Representation of German Jews of the Reich,” France had its “General Union of Jews of France” [UGIF], Belgium an “Association of Jews in Belgium”. The Netherlands, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania and, in Greece, Salonika had their Jewish Councils. Those of the Netherlands, Slovakia and Hungary were particularly cooperative. Through their collaboration with the Germans many Jews amply secured their subsistence: certain of them, such as Joinovici and Skolnikoff, built colossal fortunes.

During the war, contacts between certain Zionist circles and the Germans continued. In 1941 the “Stern Gang” and “Lehi” even offered a military alliance with Germany against Britain. An emissary of the Jewish body, Naftali Lubenchik, met the diplomat Otto Werner von Hentig in Beirut for talks on the subject.

Germany Was Ready to Hand Jews over to the Americans and the British

After considering several possible territorial solutions of the Jewish question, solutions which, like the “Madagascar Projekt,” proved unworkable, Germany was ready to hand over the Jews of Europe to the Americans and British but on the condition that they keep those Jews within their own territories until the end of the war and not allow them to emigrate to Palestine, in order to spare “the noble and valiant Arab people.”

Indeed, for example in 1944, the German Foreign Ministry (headed by Joachim von Ribbentrop) informed the British government that Germany was ready to hand over 5,000 “non-Aryan” persons – of whom 85% would be children and the other 15% adults accompanying them – from Poland, Lithuania and Latvia, but on condition of receiving the guarantee that they would be hosted till the end of the war in the British Empire (for example in Canada), barring Palestine and the rest of the Middle East. “The Reich Government cannot lend itself to taking part in a manoeuvre that would tend to let the Jews chase the noble and valiant Arab people from their homeland, Palestine” (Nuremberg document NG-1794, Eberhardt von Thadden, on 29 April and 5 May 1944; Wagner, July 29, 1944. Henri Monneray, former deputy prosecutor at the International Military Tribunal, *La persécution des juifs dans les pays de l’Est présentée à Nuremberg*, Paris, Editions du Centre de documentation juive contemporaine, 1949, p. 168-169).

On January 15, 1945 Heinrich Himmler met the former Swiss President Jean Marie Musy in the Black Forest town of Wildbad; the latter was there at the behest of the Americans to discuss once again “the improvement of the Jews’ lot.” Previous talks had already had their effect on one point: previously subject to being assigned, like all others, to the hardest labor, the Jews were now granted a privilege,

that of not being assigned to “hard labor” but only to “normal work.” In a note on this meeting Himmler wrote:

I again put forth my position to him. We assign the Jews to labor and that, of course, includes hard work such as the building of roads and canals, mining, and there they have a high mortality rate. Since the start of discussions on improving the Jews' lot, they have been employed in normal work, but it goes without saying that they must, like all Germans, work in armaments production. Our view on the Jewish question is as follows: the position taken by America and England regarding the Jews does not interest us in any way. What is clear is that we do not want to have them in Germany and in the German living space, given the decades of experience since the [First] World War, and we shall not join in any discussion on the matter. If America wants to take them, we are glad of it. But it must be ruled out, and here a guarantee will have to be given to us, that the Jews whom we allow to leave [continental Europe] via Switzerland can ever be sent back to Palestine. We know that the Arabs, just as much as we Germans, reject the Jews and we do not want to partake in such an indecency as the sending of more Jews to that poor nation tormented by the Jews (zu einer solchen Unanständigkeit, diesem armen, von der Juden gequälten Volke neue Juden hinzuschicken) (document of the US Document Center, Berlin. Photograph in Werner Maser, Nürnberg, Tribunal der Sieger, Munich-Zürich, Droemer Knauer, 1979, p. 262-263).

Excesses Committed against Jews Could be Punished by Death

Many other precise material details exclude the possibility of the German authorities' having pursued a policy to exterminate the Jews, but I think the very strongest evidence of the non-existence of such a policy lies in the fact that, during the war, the murder of a sole Jewish man or woman by a German ran the latter the risk of a sentence up to the death penalty, and execution. For lack of space here, I refer the reader to the text of a talk on this subject that I gave in 2002 entitled “Punishment of Germans, by Third Reich Authorities, for Mistreatment of Jews (1939-1945)”

(<http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/2002/06/punishment-of-germans-by-third-reich.html>).

The Imposture of the Six Million. Wilhelm Höttl and the Nuremberg Tribunal Unmasked

In the next few paragraphs I intend to show first how the myth of the Six Million Jews supposedly killed or otherwise deceased during the Second World War was born, then through what lies it came to be endorsed – thanks to its particular lying inventor – by the International Military Tribunal (IMT) of Nuremberg and, finally how, in 1987, I personally managed, in the presence of a witness, to confound former SS officer Wilhelm Höttl for having given false testimony by stating in writing and under oath that he had gotten that figure from the mouth of Adolf Eichmann himself.

It was in 2003 that the American Don Heddesheimer, a lawyer by profession, revealed to us that the myth of the Six Million had arisen from the most sordid source imaginable: from 1900 (and perhaps even earlier) certain Jews in New York had made up and launched a lucrative advertising slogan that allowed them to collect millions of dollars through fundraising campaigns. The slogan they devised was of two short sentences: “At this time millions of our brothers are dying in Europe. Give us money to come to their aid.” In general, those European Jews were supposed to number “five million” or “more than five million” or, especially, “six million.” Depending on the circumstances and periods, the Jews' killers were presented as being the Russians, the Ukrainians, the Tsars, the Poles, ... (*The First Holocaust / Jewish Fund-Raising Campaigns with Holocaust Claims during and after World War One*, Preface by

Germar Rudolf, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, October 2003, p. 144). The newspaper contributing most to the dissemination of slogans peculiar to such campaigns was the *New York Times*. One of the most active personalities involved was Rabbi Stephen Wise (1874-1949), a friend, successively, of Presidents Wilson and, especially, F. D. Roosevelt; founder of the World Jewish Congress, he was a militant Zionist.

With the start of the Second World War the designated killers became Hitler or the Germans, while the European Jews were decreed “dead” or “killed” and no longer merely “dying.” In 1945-1946 75% of the American delegation at the Nuremberg Trial happened, it seems, to be Jewish; the estimate is that of U.S. Executive Trial Counsel Thomas J. Dodd (from the September 20, 1945 letter to his wife, published in a book co-authored by his son, Christopher J. Dodd, and Larry Bloom, *Letters [of Thomas J. Dodd] from Nuremberg*, Crown Publishers [Random House], p. 136). Presumably at least some of the Jews there, having grown up with the refrain of “millions of European Jews being dead or bound to die” in their ears, ended up believing in good faith what they heard or read on the subject. For them, the main thing was to have that belief endorsed by the Nuremberg judges.

To attain their objective they would use a most dubious character, a former SS major and lieutenant-colonel who, in the last months of the war, in Italy, sensing that he risked ejection from the SS for both embezzlement and contact with the enemy, had gotten in quite close touch with the Allied authorities. At war’s end, having become one of their exemplarily docile prisoners, he was transferred to Nuremberg, where he fully cooperated with the prosecution. It was to him, in particular, that the prosecutors owed the impressive organization chart of the German Security Police and the Security Service (Document 2346-PS) bearing his signature. On November 26, 1945 he agreed to sign an affidavit (Document PS-2738) in which he claimed that at the end of August 1944, at his apartment in Budapest, he received a visit from his colleague Lieutenant Colonel Adolf Eichmann, who advised him that he had recently submitted a report to Himmler, who had wanted to know the exact number of Jews killed thus far. According to the report, Eichmann put it exactly this way: “Approximately 4,000,000 Jews had been killed (*getötet*) in the various extermination camps (*Vernichtungslagern*), while an additional 2,000,000 met their death in other ways, the major part of whom were shot by operational squads of the Security Police during the campaign against Russia.” And he added that Himmler had not appreciated this report because, for him, the number of Jews killed had to be more than six million.

The affidavit was read out in court on December 14, 1945 by the American assistant trial counsel William Walsh, who committed the dishonesty of translating the suspect word *Vernichtungslagern* by the classic phrase “concentration camps.” A German lawyer spoke up, requesting the appearance of Höttl. He would never obtain it. And the height of it all was reached when, in the final ruling, the Tribunal presumed to conclude, on September 30, 1946: “Adolf Eichmann, who had been put in charge of this program by Hitler, has estimated that the policy pursued resulted in the killing of six million Jews, of which four million were killed in the extermination institutions” (*IMT*, I, p. 252-253). The truth is that never had Hitler put Eichmann or anyone else in charge of such a program, and that the estimate was not that of Eichmann but, instead, had been *attributed* to him by W. Höttl. After the war Höttl continued to work with the Allies in the fear of being handed over to a Hungary governed by communists who would not have failed to execute him.

Meanwhile his colleague Eichmann lived in Argentina until the day in 1960 when he was kidnapped by the Mossad and taken by force to Israel to be found guilty at the end of a judicial farce even worse than

that of Nuremberg. In the investigatory phase of his case, examining magistrate Avner Less, a captain in the Israeli Army, asked Eichmann whether he had any comments on the statements made about him by Höttl, and the response was: "Yes indeed! Höttl's allegations are a hotchpotch of muddles that the man has stuffed his head with" (*Jawohl! Die Angaben von Höttl, das ist ein von Sammelsurium von Durcheinander, das der Mann seinen Kopf bekommen hat*; see Jochen von Lang, *Das Eichmann-Protokoll*, Berlin, Severin und Siedler, 1982, p. 107). Eichmann then pointed out that the advent, after the war, of millions of survivors belied the possibility that there had existed any programme of physical extermination of the Jews. He stated, for example, on the next page: "Captain, after the war the Allies nonetheless counted – I think – 2.4 million Jews. And hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Jews came out of the concentration camps" (*Herr Hauptmann, da sind immerhin – glaube ich – wie gesagt, es sind 2.4 Millionen von den nach Alliierten Kriegsschluss gezählt worden. Und Hunderttausende von Juden kamen aus den Konzentrationslagern*). When, for his part, he employed the word "Vernichtung" regarding the Jews, he had in mind the annihilation of the Jews' power (in the framework of the search for a possible "final territorial solution to the Jewish question") and not the sense that the translators like to give that word, that is, "physical extermination" (p. 110).

In 1987 W. Höttl, beset by his compatriots' criticism or requests for clarification about the words he had ascribed to his colleague Eichmann, began to retreat. He suddenly claimed that it was under the influence of alcohol that the latter had spoken; he had, apparently, let Eichmann drink profusely of his favorite apricot-based Hungarian spirit, *barack* (*Welt am Sonntag*, March 8, 1987, p. 2). I wrote to him at his home in Altaussee in Austria, where he was a school principal. I got him to promise to see me on two consecutive days in the company of an Austrian called R. M. On February 3, 1989 R. M. and I were received in Höttl's office. I had not hidden anything about my revisionist beliefs from him. I asked him some questions about his August 1944 interview with Eichmann. I let him talk at length, but suddenly I told him that, for at least two reasons, I did not believe the contents of his affidavit: firstly, six million Jews killed by July or August 1944, when there were still about nine months of war to come, would imply for the whole duration of the war an even higher figure than the already huge and unproved one of six million (the equivalent of the population of a country like Switzerland); then, I noted in the same affidavit a word that seemed an anachronism – and it is well known that in history anachronism is one of the signs of falsehood. The word in question was *Vernichtungslagern*, that is, "extermination camps." It is precisely the German translation of an American neologism, "extermination camps," having first appeared in Washington in November 1944 in the famous "War Refugee Report" or "Auschwitz Protocol[s]", which the world owes to the mythomaniac "Holocaust" witness Rudolf Vrba (<http://www.holocaustresearchproject.org/othercamps/auschproto.html>). It is most unlikely that Eichmann should have used such an expression in August 1944 in Budapest.

Visibly struck by the argument, our interlocutor, losing all self-assurance, asked us in a plaintive tone: "Why do you lend so much importance to that statement of Eichmann's?" And he explained that the man was under the influence of alcohol and that he suffered relative to himself, Wilhelm Höttl, from *an inferiority complex, which led him to inflate the facts and figures*. In other words, Höttl suddenly called into question the central point of his own affidavit. He even withdrew all value from it. However, it was that ringing declaration which, subsequently, would allow the Tribunal to launch the announcement to the world of Germany's extermination of six million Jews. Höttl had lied; then, as seen above, to that lie the judges at Nuremberg added their own lie in coldly attributing the statement to Eichmann himself.

On the morning after that interview R. M. and I were preparing to leave our hotel and go, as agreed, to the second meeting with Höttl when the telephone rang: it was Mrs. Höttl informing us that her husband was unwell and could not see us.

Today, R. M. is still alive and can attest to what I say here and which, in any case, is recorded in our correspondence. I must say that, thereafter, I maintained correspondence with Höttl. I suggested that he leave to posterity a piece of writing in which he might set the record straight. His response and the ensuing letters show a man decided on rejecting my suggestion but nonetheless troubled. In 1997 he published *Einsatz für das Reich (In the Service of the Reich)* (Koblenz, Verlag S. Buble). Curiously, in the section on "Eichmann and the Six Million" he showed himself discreet and evasive on the heart of the matter and even wrote: "The figure of 6 million seems, anyhow, to be magical" (*Diese Zahl von 6 Millionen scheint irgendwie magisch zu sein*) (p. 83). Some of his remarks were openly revisionist (pp. 82-85 and 420-423) but he took the precaution of ending with a profession of Holocaustic faith which I would describe as merely verbal. He died two years later at the age of 84. History will record his treachery. But Höttl may be granted consideration of mitigating circumstances: in the first place, on a personal level, had he refused to cooperate with the Americans he would have been consigned to the Hungarians, who would have hanged him; and he would have had to be a hero to defy the victors' justice, the Jewish thought police and the religion of the "Holocaust," which, in the 1980s, wrapped in an aura of sacred terror, was, little by little, to invade the entire Western world.

The Present State of Things

As of today, on the strictly historical and scientific plane, the assessment is disastrous for the proponents of the official truth. There remains not one stone upon another of the edifice built by the 1945-1946 Nuremberg Tribunal, the Jerusalem Tribunal of 1961, and by Léon Poliakov, Gerald Reitlinger, Raul Hilberg and a crowd mainly of Jewish authors. To confine ourselves to the three essential elements of the charge brought against Adolf Hitler and the Third Reich, no one, in the sixty-five years and more since the war, has been able to find a single order to kill the Jews, or a single proof that there existed a single homicidal gas chamber or gas van, or a single proof that six million European Jews were murdered or had simply died, of whatever cause, during the Second World War. When the American revisionist Bradley Smith, head of the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH), asks his country's academics to provide him, with supporting evidence, the name of one person who died in a gas chamber at Auschwitz, he is answered with insults or silence. Why?

For his part, E. Wiesel wrote in 1994: "Let the gas chambers remain closed to prying eyes, and to imagination" (*All Rivers Run to the Sea / Memoirs*, New York, Knopf, 1995, p. 74; original French version: *Tous les fleuves vont à la mer / Mémoires*, Paris, Seuil, 1994, p. 97); here he makes a confession: that of feeling a terrible embarrassment, which he shares with all his ilk, historians included. When he adds: "We will never know all that happened behind those doors of steel" he is indulging his "imagination," for the only alleged "gas chamber" that one may visit at Auschwitz has two very ordinary wooden doors, one of which is partially glazed (and opens inwards, where dead bodies had supposedly piled up!); as for the third opening, it gives free access to the room containing furnaces, a coke repository and funerary urns: the ovens, at times heating up to 900° C, would have stood in direct proximity to the "gas chamber" full of a substance – the disinfectant Zyklon B – emitting hydrogen cyanide gas, known for its explosive nature! In the second volume of his memoirs Wiesel returns to this need to say nothing, tell nothing, imagine nothing about the alleged "gassings": "I believe I know

everything, can guess everything, about the victims' final hours. I shall say nothing. To imagine would be indiscreet. To tell would be indecent," and he adds that, on the spot, at Auschwitz-Birkenau, "As we get closer to the place where the killers built their gas chambers and their crematories [in reality, ruins of simple crematoria – RF], we clench our teeth and suppress the desire to scream."

Yet with his fellow Jews he will first murmur, then "the murmur becomes a scream, the cry of a community gone mad, mad with grief and lucidity" (... *And the Sea Is Never Full / Memoirs 1969-*, New York, Knopf, 1999, p. 193; original French version: ... *et la mer n'est pas remplie / Mémoires 2*, Paris, Seuil, 1996, p. 291).^[1] Further on he repeats: "I forbid myself to imagine what happened inside the gas chambers; my gaze follows the living people who enter them to die of suffocation only as far as the entrance" (p. 356). Here we are, immersed in pathos. In *La Nuit* there is no mention of the "gas chambers"; E. Wiesel tells us that at Auschwitz as at Buchenwald it was outdoors, in infernal flames, that the Germans exterminated the Jews. In the German translation of his book, the "gas chambers" burst onto the scene: in fifteen instances, the translator has put gas where the author had not (see "Un grand faux témoin (suite): Elie Wiesel", either in my *Ecrits révisionnistes (1974-1998)*, p. 1526-1529 or on my blog at <http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/1993/06/un-grand-faux-temoin-elie-wiesel-suite.html>).

It was the Catholic intellectual François Mauriac who, in his preface, spoke of "the gas chamber" and the "oven fuelled with living creatures" and, to start, evoked "those carriages stuffed with little boys" (p. 10; one will note the word "stuffed" – *bourrés* – and the absence of any little girls). "*Anus Dei*", as Mauriac was dubbed with a quip attributed to Paul Léautaud, had been seduced by the young Wiesel and could refuse him nothing. The English translation of the book is not without interest (*Night*, New York, Bantam Books, paperback edition of 1982: "This edition contains the complete text of the original hardcover edition [1960]. NOT ONE WORD HAS BEEN OMITTED", XIV, 111 p.). Mauriac's preface is the object of some significant changes or attenuations: three times "*Israélien*" or "*israélien*" is translated as "Jew"; "*l'œil bleu*" of the young Elie Wiesel turns into "dark eyes," "*millions de morts*" fades to "thousands of dead" and, above all, "*ces wagons bourrés de petits garçons*" become "those trainloads of little children." At the beginning of Chapter II of *La Nuit* in the original French edition (1958) there were carriages filled with eighty people, in which "freed from all social censure, the youths openly gave themselves over to their instincts and, under cover of darkness, copulated in our midst, paying no mind to anyone, alone in the world. The others pretended not to see anything." In more recent editions, for example that of 2007, "*s'accouplaient*" has become "*s'attouchaient*". The translations into English have at times kept "to copulate" (*The Night Trilogy*, paperback edition, first published 1987, Canada, Harper Collins, fifteenth printing, 1997), with others choosing "to flirt." With E. Wiesel, whether he talks or writes, transformations and cheating are to be found at every turn.

All throughout his public existence "the Pope of the Holocaust religion" has made up for the bankruptcy of the official historians. We have not a single proof, not a single document to prove the "Holocaust" but we indeed have the performances of the clown Elie Wiesel and his acolytes. Where a historical subject of great gravity called for sober historians, we have had only histrions; Elie Wiesel is the first among these: a clown, a histrion crowned with a Nobel Prize.

Good News for Poor Humanity

Thanks to the Internet, the achievements and victories of revisionism will finally be within the whole world's reach. For E. Wiesel and his associates, for Jewish organizations in general, for the Zionists and the State of Israel, the news is bad, but for common humanity it is good. Reputedly capable of all

possible horrors, humanity has nonetheless still not committed the supreme horror that would have consisted in coldly seeking to exterminate an entire “race,” particularly in veritable death factories. This “crime of crimes” was not committed: *Germany has not committed the irreparable*. She has been atrociously maligned. Has her very soul ended up being killed? The future will tell.

For 66 years, by virtue of the assumption that the unprecedented horror had unquestionably happened, we have been constantly subjected to the same chant: “How could the country of Goethe and Beethoven, land of so many great minds, scholars, benefactors of humanity have committed the crime of crimes?”, or again “How could the world stay silent? How is it that Pope Pius XII, so hostile to Adolf Hitler, never mentioned the gas chambers either during or after the war?”, or “How can it be explained that neither in their statements nor in their respective memoirs Churchill, Eisenhower, de Gaulle, although ruthless in denouncing the crimes of National Socialism, should never have mentioned those gas chambers that were the ultimate weapon of mass destruction of Jews?”, or “How is it that so many Jews – derisively called ‘Brown Jews’ – should have agreed in the countries occupied by the German army, or in ghettos or camps, to cooperate with the Nazis?”, or, finally, “What is behind the overall silence of nations and, in particular, that of Switzerland and the International Committee of the Red Cross, in the face of the Holocaust then underway?” These and other questions of like nature have an answer: *the crime of crimes was not committed*. The Jews were treated by National Socialist Germany as declared or potential enemies but they were never steered towards physical extermination; during a total war in which millions of civilians perished many Jewish civilians died but many survived. More than sixty-five years after the war we are still awaiting estimates that can be verified.

After the war, Jewish survivors or miraculous survivors were to be counted by the million, to the point that they could people a new State called Israel and disperse in some fifty countries in the great wide world.

Times Are Changing, Fast and Profoundly

The “Holocaust” will go down in history as one of the most fabulous impostures of all time. The State of Israel has so far owed its survival only to this imposture which, in its eyes, justifies the theft of a territory, a cruel apartheid and perpetual war: this state is headed towards its doom as well. The Jewish organizations in the diaspora have failed. Their arrogance, their pressure, their blackmailing methods, their constant calls for repression against those who open, one after another, the black boxes of the “Holocaust” have not prevented a development throughout the world of widespread skepticism and fatigue with regard to stories illustrating the purportedly exceptional character of an incomparable Jewish suffering. The Jews on the whole have had bad shepherds, who are leading them to the abyss. They would be well advised to listen to those among them, few for the moment, who, whether in a low voice or out loud, denounce the Great Imposture of the Holocaust, the Great Imposture of the State of Israel and the Great False Witnesses in the style of Elie Wiesel.

The revisionists have discovered the sinister black boxes of the “Holocaust,” then opened them and decrypted the contents for us. They have been able to unmask the apostles or disciples of a secular religion grounded in conceited pride, lies, hatred and greed. To all people, without distinction, the revisionists can bring relief: they teach us that, despite a capacity for every kind of horror, humanity has, after all, never committed the unspeakable slaughter for which, over several generations, some have presumed to blame it at every hour of the day or night, demanding ever more financial compensation, ever more privileges. Today we are facing a secular religion, that of the “Holocaust” or “*Shoah*,” which is

bound to go down in history as the dishonor of men. This religion originated in the Western world and has developed there at a dazzling pace, but is already falling into decay. The rest of the world does not want it, sometimes even expressly rejecting it. The “Judeo-Christian” West would be well advised to take note of this and follow the example given by the rest of the world.

Notes:

- [1] The English edition lacks the sentences presented above as “To imagine would be indiscreet. To tell would be indecent [...] the whisper becomes a scream, the cry of a community gone mad, mad with grief and lucidity.” The translation of *And the Sea Is Never Full* is the work of E. Wiesel’s wife Marion. According to an American researcher Mrs. Wiesel has in the past purposely mistranslated certain words so as to deceive the reader and, in several passages in *Night*, resorted to the practice in an attempt to right the account’s confused chronology. The researcher in question, who has a perfect command of French, informs us as well that, as is the case here, she has at times simply chosen not to include certain words or sentences if she believes a faithful translation might suggest to English readers that E. Wiesel is not, after all, a reliable witness.

Author(s) :	Robert Faurisson
Title:	The Victories of Revisionism (Part 2)
Sources:	<i>Inconvenient History</i> , 8(1) 2016
Dates:	published: 2016-02-18, first posted: 2016-03-15 01:35:53

<http://inconvenienthistory.com/8/1/4031>